



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## II.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE GREEK MILITARY MANUAL ATTRIBUTED TO 'AENEAS TACTICUS'.

The treatise commonly assigned to 'Aeneas Tacticus' or 'Poliorceticus' has hitherto not received the attention which it certainly deserves. Had it been recently discovered in the sands of Egypt, there is no doubt that it would have immediately attracted a large throng of eager students; its real merits would be appreciated, and perhaps it would duly take its place as a 'Companion' to the Greek historians read in schools and colleges. It is a book that should awaken the interest of the student of history and at the same time appeal to the average fifth-form school-boy. The latter would turn with delight from the 'parasangs' of Xenophon to the various suggestions for the composition and despatch of secret missives by means of slight marks on the letters of a book rolled up in a bale of cloth, or messages written on thin sheets of tin stealthily slipped between the soles of the bearer's shoes, enclosed in the ear-rings of women or inscribed on leaves tied as plasters over a wound, curious precautions regarding passwords, the expulsion of tramps, the use of vinegar to quench fire, cunning devices for detaching the bolt of a city gate, and the smuggling of swords in cucumbers. This little tractate really adds to our appreciation and knowledge of the history of Greece. No better commentary could be desired on the interrelations of small Greek states, the constant fear of treachery within, and the interminable strife with neighbours whose home is but a few miles away. Many valuable side-lights are cast upon special points of interest, as, for instance, the Theban attack upon Sparta 362 B. C. (ch. 2), the description of the harbour of Chios (ch. 11), and the earliest version of the stratagem employed by Pisistratus against the Megarians at Eleusis, which is undoubtedly the original form of the absurd story of Solon at Colias offered by later writers (Plut. Solon 8, Polyaeus 1. 20. 1) as an explanation of the capture of Salamis.

In preparing a revision of the text with an introduction and notes, which I hope to see published before long, I have been

greatly struck by the one-sided tendency of nineteenth century criticism as applied to this Manual. Much labour and ingenuity have been expended in ferreting out interpolations, and detecting real or supposed changes in the original arrangement of the various sections. Thanks to the energy of Hercher, Hug, and others who have contributed *observationes criticae ad Aen. Tact.*, the text is now in a fairly satisfactory condition, although Hug has gone too far in the ejection of whole paragraphs as interpolated; but on the question of authorship all students have been only too ready to follow the tradition inaugurated by Casaubon. In the following discussion we shall first consider the evidence of the MSS and then deal with the statements of the ancient authors generally quoted in support of the current theory.<sup>1</sup>

In M, our best manuscript, the treatise has the following superscription: *Αἰλιανοῦ τακτικὸν ὑπόμνημα περὶ τοῦ πῶς χρὴ πολιορκουμένους ἀντέχειν*. It is easy to dispose of this claim to the honours of authorship put forward on behalf of a man who wrote a book on 'The Theory of Tactics' about the beginning of the second century A. D. The contents of the Manual which forms the subject of the present article afford unmistakable and overwhelming evidence that it was composed not long after the year 360 B. C.<sup>2</sup> It was first edited by Casaubon in 1609, as an appendix to his edi-

<sup>1</sup> The MSS are: 1. M, The Medicean. Plut. LV, 4. 10th or 11th cent. The others are all copies of M. 2. C, Paris. 2443, used by Casaubon for his edition; "descriptus manu Angeli Bergicii, hominis Graeci, qui ante annos sexaginta . . . depinxit" (Cas. praefatio). 3. B, Paris. 2522. 16th cent. 4. A, Paris. 2435. There is a reference to a Vatican MS in the praefatio of Cas.; "Conradi Gesneri indicio didicimus, huius libri exemplar in Vaticana Romae servari." Hug is probably right in assuming this remark to be due to a mistake caused by the title of a treatise in Vat. 1164, for which see *infra* (cf. *Aen. von St.* p. 1, note 1). For a list of editions and pamphlets see the Bibliography at the end of this article.

<sup>2</sup> We have a *terminus post quem* in ch. 24, where mention is made of the capture of Ilium by Charidemus, an event which is known to have occurred in 360 B. C. In ch. 31 the Locrian custom of sending women to Ilium is referred to as still in existence; a fragment of Timaeus (66) informs us that it was abolished in 346. Hug by a skilful tabulation of events of known date mentioned by the author has shewn that these increase in number as we draw near to the year 360 B. C. He confidently fixes the date at '359 or at latest 358 B. C.' (*Aen. v. St.* p. 8). It would perhaps be safer to allow ourselves a wider margin. The passage about the Locrians is rejected as spurious by Hercher and Hug on grounds of style and irrelevancy; perhaps without good reason. Their theory involves the assumption of interpolation at a very early date.

tion of Polybius. Although the MS at his disposal (C, Par. 2443) had the superscription *Αινείου ἡ αἰλιανοῦ τακτικόν τε καὶ πολιορκητικὸν ὑπόμνημα περὶ τοῦ πῶς χρῆ πολιορκουμένων* (sic) *ἀντέχειν*, Casaubon without the least hesitation published the treatise under the name of Aeneas. With the single exception of F. Lindenbrog<sup>1</sup> no scholar has yet come forward to defend the claim of Aelian, or even ventured to cast any doubts upon the credentials of Aeneas.

The ascription to Aelian is not the only charge that can be laid against the superscription of M. The title cannot be regarded as a satisfactory description of the subject-matter of the Manual. What meaning are we to assign to the word *τακτικόν*? The treatise has very little to say about the 'disposition of troops' which is the idea generally conveyed by the word when used by classical writers;<sup>2</sup> it covers a much wider area and deals with various topics ranging from a commandant's right of opening private correspondence and locking inns on the outside in time of danger, to the exposure of the latest dodge for smuggling armour of all kinds in bundles of ready-made clothing, not to speak of hints on the use of dogs in war, the provision of passports to resident aliens, and precautions against fire. Casaubon, feeling the difficulty, suggested in a note ad loc. that *τακτικόν* was used in the sense of *στρατηγικόν* and that *τακτικόν . . . . . ὑπόμνημα* was the title of the whole work of which the *περὶ τοῦ πῶς κτλ.* is merely a small portion. Later writers, it is true, use the word *τακτικός* in the sense claimed for it here; but it never altogether lost its special meaning. There is certainly no need for it in the present connection, and it looks very awkward in combination with *περὶ τοῦ πῶς κτλ.*

So little faith had Casaubon himself in his own explanation<sup>3</sup> that even before submitting it to the consideration of the conservative reader who wishes to retain the MS reading at all costs, he had already proposed to alter the wording of the superscription into *Αινείου τοῦ τακτικοῦ*.

To the remainder of the superscription (*πῶς χρῆ κτλ.*) no possible objection can be offered; no more concise or appropriate de-

<sup>1</sup> In a letter written 20th July, 1618. He believed Aelian to be the author.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Xen., Mem. III. 1. 6, Cyrop. I. 6. 14. Cf. the def. of *ἡ τακτική* by Aeneas as *ἐπιστήμη πολεμικῶν κινήσεων* quoted in Aelian, Tactics 3. 4. K R II. 1. p. 268 (=Köchly u. Rüstow. See Bibliography).

<sup>3</sup> Köchly and Rüstow accept it; cf. their note ad loc. "dass *τακτικόν* hier ziemlich gleichbedeutend mit *στρατηγικόν* sei, bemerkt Casaub. richtig."

scription of the book has yet been suggested. Of the various combinations found in our MSS or submitted by modern critics, this alone has hit the happy mean; it includes every portion of the book and again does not err on the side of redundancy or superfluity. The words *πῶς χρὴ κτλ.* comprise all the multifarious recommendations that may be made to a general who wishes to defend his country from all possible danger.

Is it possible to explain the occurrence of Aelian's name in the title? There can be no doubt that Arnold Hug has found the correct solution.<sup>1</sup>

In M our Manual comes immediately after a work by Aelian which bears the superscription *Αἰλιανοῦ τακτικά*, and the subscription *Αἰλιανοῦ ἀρχιερέως τακτικὴ θεωρία*. Evidently this suggested to a scribe the addition of the words *Αἰλιανοῦ τακτικὸν ὑπόμνημα* to the title of the manual he was about to copy. So far Hug. But what could have induced a scribe or reader to father the Manual upon the author of the preceding treatise? The reason must have been that when he found it, the Manual was anonymous, like many other treatises of which copies are preserved in M. It is hardly probable that the superscription originally contained the name *Αἰνείου*, and that this was intentionally changed into *Αἰλιανοῦ*. Arguing from the evidence of the only MS available (C), in which the title begins with *Αἰνείου ἢ αἰλιανοῦ*, Casaubon was quite justified in regarding the second name as an interpolation.<sup>2</sup> After the publication of M, written in the 10th or 11th century, of which all the other MSS, written in the 16th, are mere copies, such a theory is no longer tenable; for the name of Aeneas has no place in the title given by our earliest MS. We might of course assume that a scribe, copying a MS earlier than M, accidentally changed *Αἰνείου* into *Αἰλιανοῦ*, as the name he had written but a moment before was still in his mind's eye; but this would not account for the words that follow the name, viz., *τακτικὸν ὑπόμνημα*, which are awkward as they stand and were undoubtedly suggested by the subscription of Aelian's treatise. Seeing no mention of the author's name in the title, a man who wished for information on the point would naturally turn to the end of the book in the hope of finding more light in a subscription. None but an indifferent and reckless reader would cut the knot by immediately borrowing an author from the preceding treatise without first seeking for some clue in the book itself. That the

<sup>1</sup> Aeneas von Stymphalos, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Praefat. Cas.

composer of our present superscription expended some thought upon the matter is proved by the fact of his having recast the old title and added what he considered a suitable link to join the name of the author to the original *πῶς χρῆ*.<sup>1</sup> Is it not likely that our Manual had no subscription in the MS which he used? The probability of this conjecture depends upon the answer to another question, What importance are we to attach to the subscription of M, *Αἰλείου πολιορκητικά ἡ Αἰλιανοῦ καθὼς ἡ ἀρχή*?<sup>2</sup> Without one dissentient voice editors and critics alike have accepted the first two words as authoritative, and regard their evidence as conclusive on the question of authorship. They are certainly right in considering the words that follow (*viz.*, *ἡ Αἰλ. κτλ.*) to be an interpolation inserted after the introduction of Aelian into the superscription.<sup>3</sup>

Although the word *Αἰλείου* has been hitherto allowed to pass unchallenged, scholars have not hesitated to criticise the appropriateness of *πολιορκητικά* as a title for the book. The word includes every variety of siege-operations, and would not naturally be used of a manual limited to instructions for the *defence* of a beleaguered city.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> He seems to have regarded our manual as a kind of appendix to Aelian's Theory of Tactics.

<sup>2</sup> After *ἀρχή* there is an erasure which would cover about twelve letters; cf. Eberhard in Bursians Jahresber. II. u. III. Jahrg. I p. 499. Hug (A. von St. p. 1.) suggests the loss of some such word as *ἐπιδεικνυσιν*. However that may be, the erasure is of no recent date; for B (Par. 2522 16th cent.) has copied the subscription exactly as given in M as we know it. (See the collation of B in KR II. 2. p. 350.)

<sup>3</sup> As superscription, text, and subscription are in the same hand, it follows that all these changes must have been made before M was written. Even in the absence of the words *καθὼς κτλ.* we could still detect the interpolation; for the insertion of *ἡ Αἰλ. after πολιορκητικά* shews these words to be an afterthought.

<sup>4</sup> The word is generally used for *offensive* siege-operations. The Byzantine 'Anonymus' edited by KR II. 2. pp. 1-208 makes the following division (§ 5. 1.): *τῆς δὲ στρατηγικῆς τὸ μὲν ἐστὶ φυλακτικὸν τῶν οἰκείων, τὸ δὲ ἀπειλητικὸν τῶν ὑπεναντίων. Ἐστὶ δὲ φυλακτικὸν μὲν μέθοδος, καθ' ἣν τις πράττων τοὺς ἰδίους φυλάξειεν καὶ ἂ τούτων ἐστίν, ἀπειλητικὸν δὲ μέθοδος, καθ' ἣν τοὺς ἐναντίους ἀμύνηται.* § 13 comes under the first heading and begins *ἐπεὶ . . . θέλομεν . . . παρασκευάζεσθαι πρὸς τὰς μηχανὰς τῶν πολιορκούντων . . .* The 15th par. in the same section runs: *τὰς δὲ διωρυκτῆρας καλουμένας χελώνας, ὅπως γίνονται, ἐν τοῖς πολιορκητικοῖς ἡμῖν ἐκπεπνύνται ὅπως δὲ χρῆ κατ' αὐτῶν ἀγωνίζεσθαι, διὰ τῶν ὑποκειμένων γνωσόμεθα,* which proves that he considered τὰ πολιορκητικά to deal

It is very strange that those who admit the inadequacy of the term *πολιορκητικά* should not have extended their scepticism to the preceding word and at least have subjected the whole subscription to a more searching enquiry. This might have led them to one important consideration which has hitherto been completely ignored, although it immediately changes the whole face of the question. In the midst of all our conjectures and more or less probable suppositions and suggestions, one fact stands out clear and distinct, and of its significance there can be no mistake. There once existed a copy of the treatise which contained no subscription in the place where it stands at present in the earliest MS; *the words Αἰνείου κ. τ. λ. come, not at the end of the book itself, but at the end of the book as given by M, where it breaks off abruptly in the middle of a sentence.*<sup>1</sup> As the superscription and subscription are in the same hand, we must take M to be a copy of a torn and mutilated original,<sup>2</sup> unless we have enough faith to convince ourselves that the scribe lost or intentionally tore off part of his own copy and then added the subscription of the whole to the portion still surviving, or that he found he had copied all he wished to have, came to a sudden stop in the middle of a sentence, turned to the end of the book he was copying and inserted its subscription. If the subscription was added by any one who had access to an un mutilated copy, is it not likely that he would have seized the opportunity to complete the half-finished sentence? We are therefore fully justified in dealing with the evidence afforded by the subscription exactly as we should treat the suggestions of Casaubon, Sauppe, or Hug,

---

exclusively with the *attack* upon a city. It is quite possible that *Αἰν. πολ.* was the title of a work by the historical Aeneas which the composer of the subscription fancied he had discovered in the treatise he had just read.

<sup>1</sup> The last paragraph runs: *περὶ δὲ τροφῆς ἀσίου καὶ ὧν σπάνις ἐν πολιορκίᾳ καὶ ὑδάτων ὡς δεῖ πῶτιμα ποιεῖν, ἐν τῇ Παρασκευαστικῇ βίβλῳ δεδῆλωται. ἐπεὶ δὲ ταῦθ' ἡμῖν εἴρηται, περὶ ναυτικῆς τάξεως δίδειμι. Ναυτικοῦ δὲ στρατεύματος δύο εἰς οὐτόλοι. Αἰνείου πολ. κ. τ. λ.*

<sup>2</sup> The later MSS have religiously copied the unfinished sentence from M. Many pages had been torn out of M before the several MSS derived from it were copied. These were the first pages of various treatises, ruthlessly pilfered for the sake of the illuminated initials. It may be suggested that the abrupt ending of our text is due to the loss of a page in the original of M, the second side of which contained the beginning of a new work with its initial. This can hardly have been the case, as the introductory reference to naval warfare implies that a discussion of some length is to follow. For the gaps in M cf. KR II i. p. 205.

that is, solely on their own merits and inherent probability. To MS *authority* we have no right to appeal, although we must admit that possibly the author of the conjecture based it upon the use of materials now no longer accessible.

No importance need be attached to the evidence of the other MSS, as they are all copies of M, and the various combinations they offer are easily accounted for. The superscription of the codex published by Casaubon (Par. 2443) is evidently a 'contamination' of the super- and sub-scription of M. There is no sub-scription in this MS. B (Par. 2522) has the same subscription as M; the superscription is also the same, but above it a later hand has added αἰνείου, ἡ αἰλιανοῦ πολιορκητικόν. (See the collation of B in KR II. 2. pp. 336-350.)

My conclusions may be briefly summarized as follows. The title πῶς χρῆ κτλ.<sup>1</sup> may well have been original. The words Αἰλιανοῦ τακτικὸν ὑπόμνημα were added after a copy of the Manual, mutilated or entire, had been inserted in a MS where it was immediately preceded by Aelian's Theory of Tactics.<sup>2</sup> The sub-scription Αἰνείου πολιορκητικά was introduced after the mutilation; there is nothing to prove that it was anterior to the superscription, while there is good reason for believing it to be of later date.

<sup>1</sup> πῶς χρῆ (or δεῖ) is a form of title very frequently met with in MSS of military treatises; cf. the titles of ch. II, VII, XV of our manual (e. g., XV πῶς δεῖ εἰς βοήθειαν ἐξίέναι). Another favorite is περὶ followed by a noun or περὶ τοῦ + infin. e. g., περὶ τοῦ φαίνεσθαι ἵππους πολλοὺς ὄντας ὀλίγους Julius Africanus (KR II. 2. p. 11). But περὶ τοῦ πῶς is very rare; only one instance of it is found in a list of 162 titles quoted (for other purposes) by KR (II. 1. p. 218, II. 2. p. 9) from Aelian's Theory and Jul. Afric., viz., Jul. Afr. ξβ' περὶ τοῦ πῶς δεῖ ἰσχυρῶς βάλλειν, whereas there are 29 instances of πῶς + verb, 28 of περὶ + noun, and 6 of περὶ + τοῦ + infin. The words περὶ τοῦ were probably added when the original superscr. was enlarged by the addition of Αἰλιανοῦ κτλ.

<sup>2</sup> The above theory involves the assumption that there had been a series of MSS containing Aelian's Theory followed by our Manual; cf. the similarity of contents in Vat. 1164 (? 11th cent.), Par. 2422 (11th cent.), Vindobon. 120 (16th cent.), Vat. 219 (dated 1406), as described by C. Wescher, Poliorcétique des Grecs, Paris. Imprimerie Impériale 1867, pp. VII-XXXVII.

Vat. 1164 and Vat. 219 (in which the treatise is more complete) contain an anonymous work entitled ὅπως χρῆ τὸν τῆς πολιορκουμένης πόλεως στρατηγὸν πρὸς τὴν πολιορκίαν ἀντιτάττεσθαι καὶ οἷσις ἐπιτηδεύμασι ταύτην ἀποκροῖνέσθαι. This was published under the title Anonymus de obsidione toleranda, by Thévenot in his Mathematici Veteres, 1693: the similarity of the Greek title has led several modern bibliographers to the erroneous assertion that the work attributed to Aeneas was published by Thévenot.



The remaining words καθὼς κτλ. are later than the superscription and the original subscription.

The word *Aeneas* is not found in the text of the treatise as given by our MSS; but it is supposed to have occurred in a passage now corrupt, where the context is assumed to afford conclusive evidence that the author was making use of his own name. The theory was first put forward by F. Haase in an interesting article dealing with The Military Writers of Greece and Rome.<sup>1</sup> In spite of several difficulties that suggest themselves, his conclusions have so far met with universal acceptance; not one voice of protest has been raised, and since the publication of this conjecture (1835) all editors and students of the manual have contented themselves with building upon the somewhat shaky foundation laid by Haase.<sup>2</sup> It would be well to examine more closely this 'remarkable confirmation' of the traditional opinion regarding our author's name.<sup>3</sup>

The section occurs in the midst of a long series of instructions and suggestions for the sending of secret despatches and cipher messages from or to a beleaguered town.

Ch. 31. §§ 17-18.

<Εἰς> ἀστράγαλον εὐμεγέθη τρυπήσαι <τρυπήματα><sup>4</sup> εἴκοσι καὶ τέτταρα, ἐξ εἰς ἐκάστην πλευρὰν τοῦ ἀστραγάλου· ἔστω δὲ τὰ τρυπήματα τοῦ ἀστραγάλου <στοιχεῖα. διαμνημόνευε δέ<sup>5</sup>> ἀφ' ἧς ἂν πλευρᾶς ἀρξῇται<sup>6</sup> τὸ ἄλφα, καὶ τὰ ἐχόμενα ἅπερ ἐν ἐκάστη πλευρᾷ γέγραπται. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, ὅταν τινὰ θέλῃς ἐν αὐτοῖς τίθεσθαι λόγον, λίνον δίειρον.<sup>7</sup> ἐὰν ἐλθῇ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ διέρσει<sup>8</sup> τοῦ λίνου, ἀρξάμενος ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς τοῦ ἀστραγάλου, ἐν ᾗ τὸ ἄλφα ἐστί, παρελθὼν τὰ ἐχόμενα τούτων γράμματα,<sup>9</sup> ὅταν ἔλθῃς<sup>10</sup> εἰς <τὴν> πλευράν, οὕτω τω τα ἐστί, δίειρον πάλιν, παρὲς δὲ τούτου τὰ ἐχόμενα, ὅπου συμβαίνει τονεῖναι, <δίειρον> καὶ πάλιν παρὲς τὰ ἐχόμενα τούτου, ὅπου ἔνεστι, δίειρον τὸ λίνον, καὶ οὕτω τὰ ἐπίλοιπα τοῦ λόγου ἀντιγράφων ἔνειρον<sup>11</sup> εἰς τὰ τρυπήματα ὥσπερ ἀρτῖαιμέθα ὄνομα.

<sup>1</sup> In the N. Jahrb. 1835; see Bibliogr.

<sup>2</sup> Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie d. Class. Altertums-Wissenschaft, s.v. Aineias, does not even tell us that the name in the text is a conjecture: cf. den richtigen Namen, *der in der Schrift selbst* (31. 18) *vor- kommt*, enthält die Subscription Αἰνείου κτλ.

<sup>3</sup> Haase, *l.c.* p. 93: Doch ist eine merkwürdige Bestätigung für die Richtigkeit des Namens aus dem Aeneas selbst noch nicht aufgefunden die wir hier beifügen wollen.

<sup>4</sup> Not in M, inserted from Julius Africanus.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. M has only ὁ.

<sup>6</sup> ἀρξῇ M: ἀρξῇται J. A.

<sup>7</sup> λίνω διαίρειν M.

<sup>8</sup> ἐν τῇ διαίρει M.

<sup>9</sup> παραγράμματα M; γράμματα J. A.

<sup>10</sup> ἐλθῃ M: ἐλθῃς J. A.

<sup>11</sup> ἐνειρε M.

Julius Africanus borrowed this passage from our author: the text printed (with a collation of three MSS) by Hercher in the appendix to his edition of 'Aeneas' is of considerable use for the restoration of the original; but it is easy to see that the scribe had quite lost the thread, and without the text of 'Aeneas' it would be impossible to get at the general sense of the passage in J. A.<sup>1</sup>

Conrad Orelli had already suggested that the unintelligible ἐλῆδινγαλί was to be explained as a corruption of the example chosen by the author for the illustration of the process he was describing; he discovered that for the first letters we should read θέλῃς, and this gives us ἐὰν θέλῃς followed by the example. So far he is certainly right, but the rest of his conjecture offers little help.<sup>2</sup>

The objection to assuming a sentence to have dropped out will be seen when we come to consider the end of the paragraph. Haase, accepting θέλῃς as correct, found in the rest of the letters the name ΑΙΝΕΙΑΣ, which Hercher changed into ΑΙΝΕΙΑΝ. It must be admitted that it is easy to account for the transformation of each letter if we assume that at the time of the corruption the word was written in uncial characters (Α = Δ, ΕΙ = Η, Ν = ΔΙ); but the rest of the section hardly warrants the certainty with which Haase's conjecture has been accepted.

Of all the letters in the word ΑΙΝΕΙΑΝ only one is referred to in the detailed instructions that follow the example in our MSS; of this one letter there can be no doubt; Co. Orelli was right in reading τὸ ν εἶναι for the MS *τονεῖναι*, although perhaps this should be changed into τὸ νῦ εἶναι, as the two letters already mentioned (ἄλφα, ἰῶτα) are written with their names in full. The presence of ι in ἐλῆδιν and the slight emendation required to change *ὄντο τω τα* into *οὐ τὸ ἰῶτα*, for which we have the support of Jul. Afr., gives us another letter of which we can be certain. We have no right to extend this certainty to the first letter. The words ἀρξάμενος ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς τοῦ ἀστραγάλου, ἐν ᾗ τὸ ἄλφα ἐστί, afford no

<sup>1</sup> The sands of Egypt may still solve our problem by restoring a papyrus containing an early text of the section in J. A.; the conclusion of Book XVIII of the *κεστοί* has been published by Grenfell and Hunt from a papyrus written before 275 A. D. (Oxyrhynchus Papyri III No. 412, 1903).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. note *ad. loc.* "Opinor scilicet verbis corruptis contentum fuisse id, quod auctor epistolae cryptae significare voluerit alteri locumque ita restituo: ἐὰν θέλῃς δηλοῦν, αἱ νῆες ἀλίζονται."

argument in favour of AIN; they simply tell us to begin on the side that contains the hole for the first letter of the alphabet.

The author is here repeating a warning already given (*διαμνημόνευε κτλ.*). It was essential that the correspondents should have previously arranged on what side of the die the alphabet should begin. The sender's natural tendency would be to pick up the die, and if he wished to indicate the letter δ draw the thread through the fourth hole on the first side that presented itself. But how was the recipient to know that the letter was δ and not κ, π, or χ, each of which would be represented by the fourth hole on one of the four sides? Such a mistake could of course only be possible with the first letter of the message. To avoid all chance of error the reader is once more cautioned to start from the side already agreed upon.

Although we are told to begin with the side containing α, we are not told to draw the thread through the hole chosen to represent that letter. Something has evidently dropped out; just as after οὐ τὸ ἰωτά ἐστὶ we have δειρον πάλιν, so after ἐν ζῇ τὸ ἄλφα ἐστὶ we should expect δειρον. The letter immediately before ιν in the MSS is δ (*εληδιν*); the hole for δ would of course be on the same side as α; it is then not impossible that after telling his readers to begin by holding the first side of the die up, the author instructed them to draw the thread through the hole that stood for δ. This conjecture is supported by the MS reading of the words that follow, viz., *παρελθὼν τὰ ἐχόμενα τούτων*, of which the last has been changed by the editors into *τούτου*. But why have we *τούτων* here only and the singular *τούτου* in the two other places where the preceding letter is referred to?<sup>1</sup> If α and δ had gone before, the MS reading would be quite intelligible.

The remainder of the passage lends very little support to the conjecture AINEIAN. Instead of *ὅπου ἔνεστιν* of the MSS Haase proposed *ὅπου ἔνεστι* or *ὅπου εἰ ἐστι*; but we still miss the article, although it has been used in the case of the other letters (α, ι, ν). After *ὅπου* a few letters must then have been lost in the copying of an earlier MS, as the corruption cannot be accounted for by the mere substitution of εἰ (=ε) for ἐν; besides, *ἔνεστι* itself is a very appropriate word. Again, the expression *παρεῖς τὰ ἐχόμενα τούτου ὅπου ἔνεστι δειρον τὸ λῖνον* seems to suggest a letter between ν and the end of the alphabet:<sup>2</sup> otherwise we should

<sup>1</sup> Viz.: *τούτου* (sc. τοῦ ι) τὰ ἐχόμενα, and τὰ ἐχόμενα τούτου (sc. τοῦ ν).

<sup>2</sup> May not the gap be filled by reading *ὅπου τὸ οὐ* or *τὸ υἱ ἔνεστι*?

expect the author to instruct his reader either to wind the string over the remaining letters and begin again on the side containing  $\alpha$  or else to go back from  $\nu$  to  $\epsilon$ .

At this point the detailed instructions suddenly break off and we are told to complete the message according to the illustration given. It is hard to see how Haase and his followers could maintain that in the corrupt *δινηαλι* we must look for a *detached* word and not the beginning of a sentence. The words *τὰ ἐπίλοιπα τοῦ λόγου* make it perfectly clear that the single example chosen above is itself part of the message to be indicated by the cipher. In spite of the corruption in the MS the general meaning is evidently "go on with the remainder of your communication according to the process worked out for an *ὄνομα*." The last words are *ὥσπερ ἄρτι ὄνομα* with a verb, probably *ἐθέμεθα* (Sauppe); there is a sharp distinction drawn between *λόγος* and *ὄνομα*, 'communication' and 'word'; there is no need to take *ὄνομα* to mean 'name' or 'noun.'<sup>1</sup>

This shews that one word had been described in full; but our MSS do not carry the process further than the letter after  $\nu$ . Our earliest MS then stands to a still earlier MS in the relation which subsists between the MSS of Jul. Afric. and a MS of the class of M. As Jul. Afr. gives detail for three letters, for the third of which the reading is corrupt, so M gives detail for four letters with a corruption of the fourth (*ἄλφα, ἰῶτα, ὅπου εἶναι συμβαίνει* Jul., *ἄλφα, ἰῶτα, τονεῖναι, ὅπου ἔνεστιν* M). When the word chosen for illustration had once been lost, it was inevitable that details of the process should be omitted in the MSS; and M stands only one step higher than the MSS of Jul. Afr.; instructions for several letters are missing.

Finally, the MS reading *ἀντιγράφων* has been changed by Hug (Proleg. p. 42) into *ΙΑΝ γράφων*; this completely obliterates the distinction between *λόγος* and *ὄνομα*, and the same charge can also be brought against the quite unnecessary conjecture *ἔως ἂν περάνης τὸ ὄνομα* which Hercher prints in his own revision of the text. Hug in his text reproduces the reading of the MS which he marks

<sup>1</sup> For *λόγος* the meaning 'message' 'communication' is fixed by its use above, *ὅταν τινὰ θέλῃς ἐν αὐτοῖς τίθεσθαι λόγον*. For the antithesis cf. the use of *ῥῆμα* and *ὄνομα*, 'expression' as opposed to 'word.' Aeschin. Ctes. 72 οὐ γὰρ ἐφη δεῖν (καὶ γὰρ τὸ ῥῆμα μέμνημαι ὥς εἶπε διὰ τὴν ἀηδίαν τοῦ λέγοντος ἅμα καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος) ἀπορρηξαι τὴν συμμαχίαν, where *ὄνομα* = *ἀπορρηξαι*.

See Plato Apol. 17. C. with Riddell's note, and Rhys Roberts' Glossary to Demetrius on Style.

with an obelisk, in his critical note, and Proleg. (p. 42) he offers  
 ὥστε περᾶναι ὃ ἐθέμεθα ὄνομα.<sup>1</sup>

But even if we had unimpeachable MS evidence for the reading suggested by Haase, it would by no means inevitably follow that the composer of the manual was using his own name. The probability would be greater, if it could be proved, as Haase thought, that *δινηαλι* stood for a single name *used apart from any context*; but, as we have already seen, the words τὰ ἐπίλοιπα τοῦ λόγου prove it to have been the beginning of a sentence. When a man wishes to give a specimen of his own handwriting or to shew how a single detached word can be transmitted in cipher, he is naturally prompted to take his own name; it is on the other hand not likely that he will do so in dealing with a typical message from the commandant of a fortress. Finally there always remains the possibility that the whole section is a quotation from some other writer; we know that our author quotes from Thucydides and Herodotus, and in no case does he acknowledge his indebtedness.

Those whose faith has once been shaken by doubts regarding the validity of the titles in the MSS and the internal evidence for the name *Aeneas*, will find but little consolation in an appeal to the testimony of Polybius and Aelian.<sup>2</sup> Our verdict must be

<sup>1</sup> ἀντιγράφων may mean 'copying', 'transcribing'; cf. στήλαι ἀντίγραφοι, Demosth. Leptin. 36; also ἀντίγραμμα, ἀντιγραφὴ, 'transcript'; (see Liddell & Scott). If any change were thought necessary, I would suggest ἀναγράφων; cf. the use of ἀναγράφειν in reference to the recipient of the cipher 31. § 19: δεήσει δὲ τὸν ἀναγινώσκοντα ἀναγράφειν εἰς δέλτον τὰ δηλούμενα γράμματα ἐκ τῶν τρηνημάτων.

<sup>2</sup> Polybius X. 44: Αἰνείας δὲ βουληθεὶς διορθώσασθαι τὴν τοιαύτην ἀπορίαν, ὃ τὰ περὶ τῶν στρατηγικῶν ὑπομνήματα συντεταγμένος, βραχὺ μὲν τι προεβίβασε, τοῦ γε μὴν δέοντος ἀκριβὴς πάμπολυ τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἐπίνοιαν ἀπελείφθη. γνοίη δ' ἂν τις ἐκ τούτων. φησὶ γὰρ δεῖν κτλ. Then comes a long quotation from the remarks of Aeneas. At the end of ch. 7. of the Manual, we have ὥς δὲ δεῖ ταῦτα (= instructions for signalling) γίνεσθαι καὶ ὥς αἰρεῖν τοὺς φρυκτοὺς, ἐν τῇ παρασκευαστικῇ βίβλῳ πλείονως εἰρηται. ὅθεν δεῖ τὴν μάθησιν λαμβάνειν, ἵνα μὴ δις περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν γράφειν συμβῇ. On this passage, Hug, who accepts the identity of our author with the Aeneas of Polybius, has the following note: καὶ ὥς αἰρεῖν τοὺς φρυκτοὺς ab interpolatore profectum esse suspicatur H(ercher), mihi totum caput VII suspectum. Aelian, Theory of Tactics, ed. KR II. 1. ch. 1, 2: καὶ περὶ τῆς καθ' Ὀμηρον τακτικῆς ἐνετύχομεν συγγραφεῖσι Στρατοκλεῖ καὶ Ἑρμείᾳ καὶ Φρόντωνι τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀνδρὶ ὑπατικῷ. Ἐξεργάσαντο δὲ τὴν θεωρίαν Αἰνείας τε διὰ πλείονων ὃ καὶ στρατηγικὰ βιβλία ἱκανὰ συνταξάμενος, ὧν ἐπιτομὴν ὁ Θετταλὸς Κινέας ἐποίησε, Πύρρος τε ὁ Ἡπειρώτης τακτικὰ συνέταξε καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ τοῦτον υἱὸς καὶ Κλέαρχος, and ch. 1, 3: ἐπέγων δέ, ὥς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, [πάντας] τοὺς συγ-

'not proven', as will be seen from the following comparison. (1) The historical Aeneas was among the first to work out the theory of tactics; our manual was written in the middle of the fourth century B. C. (2) Aeneas wrote about fire-signals, and his remarks are quoted with disapproval by Polybius; our author states that his *παρασκευαστική βίβλος* contained full instructions for the use of fire-signals. (3) Aeneas composed *στρατηγικά βιβλία* *ἰκανά, περὶ τῶν στρατηγικῶν ὑπομήματα*; our author refers to his own works 'Ἀκούσματα (38, 5), *παρασκευαστική βίβλος* (7, 4: 8, 5: 40, 8,) *ποριστική βίβλος* (14, 2), *στρατοπεδευτική βίβλος* (21, 2). He never uses forms like *τὰ παρασκευαστικά*, nor does he use *τὸ παρασκευαστικὸν κτλ.* except in one passage which Hug rejects as an interpolation (21, 1. *ἐν τῷ παρασκευαστικῷ*). The above parallels are hardly close enough to warrant the identification of the two writers. There is nothing whatever in our treatise to make it even probable that the author wrote on any subject besides 'How to defend one's country'; all the other works he mentions, as far as may be gathered from his description of their contents, may well be included under this heading; for instance, the long list of references to the *παρασκευαστική βίβλος* in chapter 8 deals exclusively with defensive warfare.

Aelian includes Aeneas among those who wrote for specialists and experts; our treatise was certainly intended for the man in the street, the mere civilian novice suddenly called upon to organize the defence of his country.

It has often been suggested that the author of our treatise was no other than Aeneas of Stymphalus, General of the Arcadian League, mentioned by Xenophon in the seventh book of the *Hellenica* (3, 1). The case has been fully worked out by Hug in a pamphlet which he boldly entitled *Aeneas of Stymphalus, an Arcadian Author of the Classical Age* (1877). A detailed examination of his arguments would take us far beyond the limits of

---

γραφεῖς ὡς εἶδoshi τὰ πράγματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συντεταχότας. In the earlier version of Aelian's *Theory*, falsely attributed to Arrian and first published by Scheffer under the title *Arriani Tactica* (Upsala, 1664), the beginning of the work is missing, the first words being ὁ Πύρρον παῖς καὶ Κλέαρχος. After the list of writers we have: ἔστι δὲ ξυμπαντα ταῦτα τὰ συγγράμματα ἐκείνη μάλιστα οὐκ ὠφέλιμα, ὅτι ὡς πρὸς εἰδότας συγγέγραπται . . . . τοῦτο δὲ αὐτὸ ἐδοξέ μοι πρῶτον ἰάσασθαι αὐτῶν τὴν ἀσάφειαν. For a discussion of the two versions see KR. II. 1. p. 86, pp. 201 sqq. The quotations from the *Manual* in *Jul. Afric.* throw no light on the author's identity. The short paragraph in *Suidas* is taken directly from Polybius (X. 44). Αἰνείας· οὗτος ἔγραψε περὶ πυρσῶν, ὡς φησι Πολύβιος, καὶ περὶ στρατηγημάτων ὑπόμνημα.

this article ; suffice it here to say that to the present writer they appear unconvincing in the extreme.<sup>1</sup> One feels that there were many other Greeks to whose claims the facts alleged to favour Aeneas of Stymphalus would afford equal support. The Arcadian general *may* have written the book, but not a scrap of proof has yet been offered to shew that he and no other *must* be the author whose name we still seek in vain.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

## EDITIONS.

- Is. Casaubon, as an appendix to his Polybius. Paris, 1609.  
 J. Gronovius, 1670. } mere copies of Casaubon's, with his  
 J. A. Ernesti, 1763. } Polybius.  
 Io. Conrad Orelli; Weidmann. Leipzig, 1818; with the Commentary of Casaubon and additional notes by Gronovius, Koës, Caspar and Conrad Orelli, and a revised text; including the Latin translation by Casaubon.  
 Köchly and Rüstow in the first vol. of their Griechische Kriegsschriftsteller 1853. Leipzig. Engelmann. Vol. II. 2. of the same work (1855) contains on pp. 336-350 a collation of B.  
 Rudolf Hercher. Editio maior et minor. Berlin, Weidmann, 1870.  
 Arnold Hug. Leipzig, Teubner, 1874.  
 A French Commentary on 'Aeneas' by Le Comte de Beausobre. Paris, 1757.

## WORKS DEALING WITH THE MANUAL.

- Eberhard, in Bursians Jahresb. II u. III. Jahrg. I p. 499, a notice of Hug's text.  
 Gronovius, supplementa lacunarum in Aenea Tactico. Lugd. Bat. 1675. Readings from M.  
 Gutschmid, in Lit. Centralblatt 1880. Sp. 589.

<sup>1</sup> The author was certainly not accustomed to operations on a large scale nor was he a member of an imperial state like Athens; of significance, perhaps, is the omission of all reference to an acropolis, and the constant assumption of the close proximity of the sea. Sauppe thinks it possible that he lived on the coast of the Hellespont or the Pontus; the author makes frequent mention of places in those regions and seems to be personally acquainted with them.

- F. Haase, in *Neue Jahrb. für Phil. u Päd.* 5 Jahrg. 14 Band. 1. Heft. 1835. pp. 88-118 contain an article entitled über die griech. u. latein. Kriegsschriftsteller with special ref. to 'Aeneas' on pp. 93-97.
- M. Haupt, in *Hermes* I. 1866. pp. 253-255. Textual.
- R. Hercher, in *Hermes* II. 1867. p. 55, pp. 64-72, p. 101. Textual; similar notes in subsequent vols. of *Hermes*.
- F. C. Hertlein (1) *Symbolae Criticae ad Aen. Tact. Progr. des Lyceums zu Wertheim für 1859.*  
 (2) *Annal. litter. Jenens.* 1874, No. 29. A review of Hug's *Prolegomena*.
- Arnold Hug, 1. *Prolegomena critica ad Aen. Poliorc.* edit. Progr. Univ. Turic. 1874.  
 2. *Aeneas von Stymphalos. Gratulationsschrift d. Univ. Zürich an die Univ. Tübingen*, 1877.  
 3. *Rhein. Mus. N. F.* 33 Bd. p. 629.  
 4. *N. Jahrb. f. kl. Phil.* Vol. 119. pp. 241 sqq., pp. 639 sqq. Textual.
- A. Kirchhoff, in *Hermes* I 1866. pp. 448-453, *Zum Poliorketikon des Aeneas.* Textual. See refs. to his letters in the praefatio to Hug's edition of *Aen.*
- G. H. C. Koës, *Epistolae Parisienses editae a Bredow.* pp. 110-124 Coll. of A and B. Leipzig, 1812.
- A. C. Lange, 1. *De Aeneae Comment. Poliorc.* Berlin. Calvary 1879, includes the *Dissert.* of 1878 (Marburg). pp. 1-204. Cap. I. *De ipso Aen. et de natura comm. pol.* Cap. II. *De Atheteseon ratione.* Cap. III *Coniect. critic.*  
 2. *Animadversiones criticae de Aen. comm. pol.* Progr. des Gymn. zu Cassel 1883.  
 3. *N. Jahrb. für kl. Philol.* Vol. 119. pp. 461 sqq. Textual.
- Meier, *Observationes in Aeneam.* Cat. lect. Univ. Halle aestatis 1835.  
 ——— also published in his *Opuscula Academ.* Vol II. pp. 292-306.
- Meineke, in *Hermes* Vol. II pp. 174-190. Textual.
- A. Mosbach, *De Aen. Tact. comm. poliorc.* Diss. Berlin, 1880. Textual (order and arrangement).
- I. Reiske, *Animadv. ad Aen. Tact.* publ. in Hercher's larger edition. pp. 128-133. Explanatory notes.



- J. Ries, *De Aen. Tact. comm. pol.* Diss. Halle, 1890. Textual (order).
- H. Sauppe, in *Götting. Gel. Anzeig.* I 1871. pp. 729-753. A review of Hercher's editions.
- Schenkl, in *Bursians Jahresb.* 1884. 1. pp. 261 sqq. Textual (order).
- M. Schmidt, in his *Miscell. Philol.* Progr. Jena, (summer) 1876. Textual.

THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF  
NORTH WALES, BANGOR.

T. HUDSON WILLIAMS.